

REMARKS

The present invention is an electronic calendar system, a wireless family calendar, a method of accessing a family calendar, and a wireless family data center as respectively defined in independent claims 1, 12, 17 and 21. In accordance with the invention, an access point 22, 22a or 42 is in wireless communication with wireless devices 20, 20a and 20b. A server associated with an Internet service provider 24 or 44 is connected to the access point. The wireless devices are connected to the server through the access point in order to obtain calendar data service therefrom with each of the plurality of wireless devices having equal access to the calendar data. The wireless devices may form a family as recited in claims 12 and 21.

Claims 1-8 and 10-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by United States Patent 6,463,463 (Godfrey et al). The Examiner reasons in part as follows:

Regarding claim 1, Godfrey et al show an electronic calendar system (column 3 lines 40-45, column 4 lines 17-30) with: a plurality of wireless devices (column 4 lines 58-63, column 7 lines 40-43), an access point in wireless communication with the wireless devices (column 3 lines 20-38, column 7 lines 35-50), a server connected to the access point (column 7 lines 30-45), with a wireless devices being connected to the server through the access point in order to equally obtain calendar data service (column 7 lines 39-5, column 8 lines 25-35, column 9 lines 1-15, Figure 1).

This ground of rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

In the first place, as the Examiner is aware, anticipation requires that every limitation of an anticipated claim to literally or inherently be present in the cited prior art. This standard has not been met by the Examiner in the rejection of the claims.

Godfrey et al discloses a "push" system and method for pushing messages including calendar event messages from a host system to a mobile data communication device as described, for example, in column 8, lines 27-35. With respect to Fig. 1, the host system 10 pushes a message A to a mobile computer 24. However, the Examiner's contention that the wireless devices are connected to the server through the access point in order to equally obtain calendar service data relying upon column 7, lines 39-5 (sic); column 8, lines 25-35; and column 9, lines 1-15; does not teach the claimed obtaining of equal access to calendar data as indicated by the Examiner. Instead, what is described in Godfrey et al is that a trigger event determines whether redirection software 12 pushes the message A to the mobile computer 24 in Fig. 1 and similarly, in Fig. 2. See column 8, lines 23-64, for a discussion of trigger events.

Nothing in Godfrey et al describe a set of trigger events where each of a plurality of wireless devices have equal access to calendar data in that "equal access to" is exclusive of a push architecture. In fact, the "push" architecture as disclosed by Godfrey et al does not provide equal access to calendar data in that the trigger event(s) determine which information is transmitted to each individual mobile device 24 and the conditions under which it is transmitted. Nothing suggests the claimed plurality of "wireless devices being connected to said server through said access point in order to obtain calendar data calendar service therefrom, each of said plurality of wireless devices having equal access to said calendar data" as recited in claim 1. What is disclosed in Godfrey et al is messages, which may be calendared data, pushed under the control of redirection software 12. The redirection software is not described and does not function to provide equal access

to a plurality of wireless devices to a server through an access point as recited in claim 1.

Claim 12 recites a wireless family calendar which is patentable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Godfrey et al do not disclose a plurality of wireless devices, forming a family.

Claim 17 recites a method of accessing a family calendar which is patentable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 21 recites a wireless family data center which is patentable for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 and furthermore, that Godfrey et al do not provide equal access to a plurality of wireless devices forming a family with equal access being provided to the bulletin board data and the calendar data and furthermore, the ability to add new data thereto.

Newly submitted claims 24-27 further limit claims 1, 12, 17 and 21 in specifically reciting that the access to calendar data or notice board data and calendar data are retrieved from the server which is the opposite of the push architecture disclosed by Godfrey et al. Accordingly, these claims are not anticipated for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 12, 17 and 21.

Claim 2 is patentable for the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 3 is patentable for the same reasons as claim 2.

Claim 4 further limits claim 1 in reciting a global address server connected to said access point which provides the plurality of wireless devices an address of a server. It is submitted that Godfrey et al do not disclose this subject matter. The

cited portion in column 7, lines 25-40, does not disclose any mechanism for addressing a server to which the plurality of wireless devices have access.

Claim 5 further limits claim 4 in reciting the calendar service and data is fetched from the server. Column 8, lines 25-32, describe the pushing of data to the mobile data communication device 24 but do not disclose that the wireless devices access calendar service and data from the server which is the opposite of the push architecture described by Godfrey et al.

Claim 6 further limits claim 5 in reciting that the calendar service and data that is fetched from the server is available to any terminal that is authenticated to be a member of the group. Godfrey et al's push architecture does not disclose anything pertaining to members of a group or an authentication thereof involving fetching information from a server.

Claim 7 further limits claim 5 in reciting the calendar service and data that is fetched from the server is available to any terminal that is authenticated by the user of the terminal to be a member of the group. This subject matter is patentable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 6 in that Godfrey et al's devices do not fetch calendar service and data.

Claim 8 further limits claim 1 in reciting that the calendar data is displayed on the wireless devices having dates listed in a linear fashion with the Examiner relying upon Fig. 10. Fig. 10 only depicts a single day so it is submitted that the subject matter of claim 8 is not taught by Fig. 10 of Godfrey et al.

Claim 10 limits claim 8 in reciting that the display is changed to introduce a new entry which is typed on a keyboard. The Examiner cites column 9, lines 52-62.

However, it is submitted that citation does not suggest a new entry to the calendar data which is typed on a keyboard.

Claim 11 limits claim 1 in reciting that the calendar data is originated partially from another application of the server. Column 10, lines 25-40, do not describe calendar data being originated partially from another application of the server.

Claim 13 further limits claim 12 in reciting that each of the wireless devices has access to individual calendar data which is not accessible by other of said plurality of wireless devices. It is therefore seen that the plurality of wireless devices forming a family contain some data which is individual calendar data which is not accessible to the other members of the family. This subject matter is not disclosed by Godfrey et al for the reason that a family of devices is not disclosed which accesses the server as stated above and furthermore, the more limited access to individual calendar data recited in claim 13 is not taught therein.

Claim 14 further limits claim 12 in reciting that the server also contains personal data and wherein each of said plurality of wireless devices has equal access to said personal data. The Examiner's reliance in column 8, lines 45-56, do not describe personal data and do not describe equal access to the personal data.

Claim 15 further limits claim 14 in reciting the personal data can be accessed by the server in forming calendar data or other data. This subject matter is not taught by column 8, lines 45-56.

Claim 16 further limits claim 12 in reciting that the calendar data is displayed on the wireless devices with days within a month being displayed in a linear fashion and with different views available for weekly and daily calendars. Figs. 6 and 11-13 do not display this information.

Claim 18 is patentable for the same reasons set forth with regard to claim 17.

Claim 19 further limits claim 18 in reciting that the access point is connected to the server through a service provider connected to the Internet. Claim 19 is patentable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 18.

Claim 20 further limits claim 18 in reciting wherein said wireless devices contain the address of a global address server and said wireless devices access the global address server to obtain the address of the server in order to connect thereto.

Claim 20 is patentable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4.

Claim 22 further limits claim 21 in reciting that the server further contains personal data and wherein each of the plurality of wireless devices has equal access to the personal data. It is submitted that Godfrey et al does not disclose a server containing personal data and wherein each of the plurality of the wireless devices has equal access to the personal data.

Claim 23 further limits claim 21 in reciting a terminal with an identifier, a gateway from the terminal to the communication services, an access point connected to the gateway through which the terminal accesses the communication service and a server connected to the gateway, the server having information of the valid identifiers of the terminals enabling service, a configuration tool on the server for managing the at least one of the configurable controlling functions of a browser from the terminal. The Examiner's citation of column 7, lines 35-43; column 10, lines 53-67; and column 10, lines 45-65; is submitted to not describe the subject matter of claim 23. If the Examiner persists in this ground of rejection, it is

requested that he more specifically point out the correlation between claim 23 and the identified portions of the specification.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, regarding antecedent basis. Claim 21 has been amended to correct the identified antecedent basis.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Godfrey et al. Claim 9 is patentable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 8.

The specification has been amended to improve its form for reexamination.


New drawings are submitted herewith which delete Figs. 4 and 6 as redundant.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the claims in the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (X00) and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Donald E. Stout
Registration No. 26,422
(703) 312-6600

Attachments
DES:dlh